

1
2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9
10 TYRONE HURT,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 JUDGE ALEXANDER WILLIAMS, JR.,
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND,

15 Defendant.
_____ /

No. C 13-80053 MISC SI


**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS* ON
APPEAL**

Order also to be filed in C 12-4187 EMC

16
17 In an order filed March 20, 2013, the Court conducted a pre-filing review of plaintiff's proposed
18 complaint, concluded that the complaint was frivolous, and directed the Clerk of the Court not to accept
19 the new complaint for filing. Plaintiff has appealed that order and has filed a motion to proceed *in forma*
20 *pauperis* on appeal. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(2), the Court DENIES that
21 motion and certifies that the appeal is not taken in good faith. As set forth in the March 20, 2013 order,
22 the proposed complaint suffers from the same types of factual and legal deficiencies as the previous
23 frivolous lawsuits that led to the declaration of plaintiff as a vexatious litigant.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25
26 Dated: April 15, 2013



SUSAN ILLSTON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE